

REMARKS

In the Official Action of November 17, 2005, the Examiner required an election under 35 U.S.C. § 121 from among five allegedly distinct inventions, namely:

Invention I, referring to claims 1-9 and 61, drawn to picture display device driving by controlled data processors and an input device, with memory;

Invention II, referring to claims 10-19, drawn to picture display device driving by controlled data processors and an input device, with memory, and communicating bi-directionally;

Invention III, referring to claims 20-29, drawn to picture display device driving by controlled data processors and an input device, with memory, communicating bi-directionally, and combining a plurality of video signals into one screen corresponding to picture sizes;

Invention IV, referring to claims 30-49, drawn to picture display device driving by controlled data processors and an input device, with memory, communicating bi-directionally, and combining a plurality of video signals into one screen corresponding to picture sizes, with a processor notifying that an input of the operation has not been performed; and

Invention V, referring to claims 50-60, drawn to picture display device driving by controlled data processors and an input device, with memory, communicating bi-directionally, combining a plurality of video signals into one screen corresponding to picture sizes, a processor notifying that an input of the operation has not been performed, and frequency measuring means.

The Examiner has contended that Inventions I, II, III, IV, and V are patentably distinct and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications.


In response to the restriction requirement, applicant hereby elects to prosecute claims 10-19 of Invention II in this application. Accordingly, claims 1-9 and 20-61 stand withdrawn from consideration in the present application without prejudice to applicant's right to file one or more divisional applications directed thereto.

In response to the Examiner's objection to the Abstract, applicant has submitted herewith a revised Abstract which conforms to all of the requirements of U.S. practice. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by the revised Abstract.

No fee is believed necessary for this response. However, if the Examiner believes a fee is due, authorization is hereby given to charge same to Deposit Account No. 12-1095.

Dated: December 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Robert B. Cohen

Registration No.: 32,768

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant